

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

On page 2, the Office Action objected to the drawings. In order to overcome these objections, replacement figures 15A and 15B are submitted herewith for original figure 15. Approval of these changes to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification, drawings, and claims 7, 33, 34, 36, 49, 51, and 61 have been amended. Claims 32 and 63-65 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-31 and 33-62 are pending and under consideration.

### Objection to the Drawings Under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a)

The Office Action objects to the drawings because “a base bracket combined to the base member to install the base member onto an inclined plane,” as recited in claim 3 from which claims 4-6 depend is not shown in the drawings. In addition, the Office Action objects to the drawings because “a base bracket combined to the base member to install the base member onto an external included plane,” as recited in claim 7 is not shown in the drawings. Applicant adds new Figure 15B to obviate this objection. Support for the addition of this drawing is found at least in paragraphs [00104] through [00106] of the specification. Therefore, applicant submits that no new matter is added.

The Office Action objects to the drawings because “another auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member, another end rotatably coupled to the monitor main body,” as recited in claim 63 from which claims 64 and 65 depend, is not shown in the drawings. Applicants cancel claims 63-65 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

### Objection to Claims 34, 49-59, and 61

Applicant amends claim 34 to correct a typographical error to obviate the objection to claim 34. Claims 49 and 51 have been amended to obviate the objection to claims 49-59. Claim 61 has been amended to provide antecedent support for “the second auxiliary link member.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims 63-65 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 63-65 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has cancelled claims 63-65 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 32-34, 36-38, 44-55, 57-59, 61, and 62

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 32-34, 36-38, 44-55, 57-59, 61, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,834,329 issued to Delapp. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Delapp does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a first auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the lower link member at a first position deviated from first axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to connect the lower link member with the upper link member through the link hinge and transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge,” as recited in claim 1.

On page 4, the Office Action appears to assert that (1) bands 54 of Delapp (col. 5, lines 1-29 and Figures 3, 4, 8, and 9) teach a “first auxiliary link member,” (2) lower arm 12 teaches a “lower link member,” (3) upper arm 13 teaches an “upper link member”, (4) elbow hub 14 teaches a “link hinge,” and (5) a turntable 9 teaches a “base member,” as recited in claim 1.

More specifically, Delapp discloses, “The bands 54 together with the gearing 50 in effect comprise a double parallelogram locking the lower and upper arms 12 and 13 together for parallel motion of the hub 16 relative to the hub 15 ...the elements of the hub 16 remain in a fixed angular relation relative to the hub elements 17 of the hub 15 and the hub elements 40 and 41 of the elbow hub 14,” (col. 5, lines 17-29).

However, bands 54 are structurally and functionally different from the “first auxiliary link member,” as recited in claim 1. For example, the bands 54 are not parallel to a lower link member at a first position deviated from a first axes of a link hinge. Instead, bands 54 appear to have the same axis as elbow hub 14.

In contrast, claim 1 states, “a first auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the lower link member at a first position deviated from first axes of the link hinge and the base hinge.” For example, at least Figures 1 and 4 and paragraphs [0085] through [0091] of the specification provide support for this feature.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Claims 2, 8, 9,10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 depend from independent claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Further, Delapp does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a second auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the lower link member at a second position deviated from second axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to connect the link hinge with the base member; and a third auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the upper link member at a third position deviated from third axes of the monitor hinge and the link hinge to connect the monitor hinge with the link

hinge," as recited in claim 2.

On page 5, the Office Action asserts that spring 70 of Delapp teaches the "second auxiliary member" of claim 2 and spring 70a teaches the "third auxiliary member" of claim 2.

In col. 5, lines 1-8, Delapp discloses, "The pair of springs 70 and 70 are enclosed in the lower arm 12 and the upper arm 13 respectively ... the arms 12 and 13 are thus biased about the pivot axis of the hubs 14, 15 and 16... the bias opposes the downward movement of the hub 16 under the weight of the monitor 2, thus counterbalancing the monitor 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that the springs 70 and 70a are not auxiliary members. Therefore, claim 2 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference for these additional reasons as well.

Delapp does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a first auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the upper link member," as recited in independent claims 36 and 62.

Applicant respectfully submits that the first auxiliary link member rotatably couples the lower link member with the upper link member, and the first auxiliary member transmits a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member. Applicant respectfully submits that Delapp does not teach or disclose this feature. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 36 and 62 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 33, 34, 36-38, 44-50, 52-55, and 57-59, and 61 depend from claim 36 and include all of the features of claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 33, 34, 36-38, 44-50, 52-55, 57-59, and 61 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

In addition, Delapp does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a second auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the link hinge," as recited in claim 49.

Further, Delapp does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a third auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the monitor main body and another end rotatably coupled to the link hinge," as recited in claim 51.

The second auxiliary link member couples the link hinge with the base member, and the second auxiliary member transmits a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the third auxiliary link member. The third auxiliary link member couples the monitor main body with the link hinge and transmits the rotary motion from the upper link

member relative to the lower link member to the monitor main body. Applicant respectfully submits that Delapp does not teach or disclose this feature. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 49 and 51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Additionally, claims 52-60 depend from claim 51 and include all of the features of claim 51. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 52-60 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 32 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of Claims 35, 39-43, 56, and 60

The Office Action rejects claims 35, 39-43, 56, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Delapp. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Delapp does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a first auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the upper link member,” as recited in claim 36.

Claims 35, 39-43, 56, and 60 depend from claim 36 and include all of the features of claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 35, 39-43, 56, and 60 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of Claims 3-7

The Office Action rejects claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Delapp in view of U.S. Patent 5,422,951 issued to Takahashi et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Takahashi”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Delapp and Takashi, taken separately or in combination do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a first auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the lower link member at a first position deviated from first axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to connect the lower link member with the upper link member through the link hinge and transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge,” as recited in claim 1.

As discussed above, Delapp does not disclose these features. In addition, Takahashi does not cure the deficiencies of Delapp.

Further, Delapp and Takahashi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "A monitor... further comprising: a base bracket combined to the base member to install the base member onto an inclined plane," as recited in claim 3.

Although Delapp discloses a monitor, Takahashi discloses a low profile telephone set mounted to a wall. Takashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest the installation of the base member of a monitor onto an inclined plane. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 3 and include all of the features of claim 3. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 4-6 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims 11, 14, 17-31, and 61

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 36 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 14 and 17-31 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, claims 14 and 17-31 do not depend from a rejected base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 61 depends from claim 36 and includes all of the features of claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 61 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-31 and 33-62 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 27, 2005

By: Paul F. Daebeler  
Paul F. Daebeler  
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501